

Applicant: GATTO
Serial No: 09/775,599
Filing Date: February 5, 2001
Page: 23 of 26

REMARKS

In response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed January 25, 2008 (hereinafter "Office Action"), claims 24-31, 37, 40-44, and 52-54 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or newly added. Therefore, claims 3-20, 24-37, 40-49, and 52-54 remain pending. Support for the instant amendments is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

EXAMINER INTERVIEW

Primary Examiner Narayanswamy Subramanian is thanked for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative (Mr. S. Jafar Ali – Reg. No. 58,780) during a telephonic interview conducted on July 9, 2008. During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the alleged rejections in view of the claim language, as set forth in further detail herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement was filed electronically by Applicant on February 6, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the cited references and provide a signed and initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission with the next Office Action.

Applicant: GATTO
Serial No: 09/775,599
Filing Date: February 5, 2001
Page: 24 of 26

Applicant is submitting herewith a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the cited references and provide a signed copy of the Form PTO-1449 for this submission with the next Office Action.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 3-20, 24-37, 40-49, and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as *allegedly* being directed to non-statutory subject matter [Office Action, pages 2-5].

Applicant disagrees with the rejection for *at least* the reason that the Examiner is improperly reading limitations into 35 U.S.C. § 101 on the subject matter that may be patented. However, *solely* in an effort to expedite prosecution, and in no way acquiescing to the propriety of the alleged rejection, the independent claims have been amended to recite, among other things, that information relating to analysts' historical estimates is retrieved "from a database operatively connected to a computer," and that historical accuracy for the analysts is determined "using the computer."

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-20, 24-37, 40-49, and 52-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is earnestly sought.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 3-20, 24-37, 40-49, and 52-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as *allegedly* being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps [Office Action, pages 5-6]. In particular, the Examiner cites the claim recitations of "a user-selected security," and alleges that "there

Applicant: GATTO
Serial No: 09/775,599
Filing Date: February 5, 2001
Page: 25 of 26

are no steps in these claims that perform the step of selection" [Office Action, page 6]. The Examiner further identifies the recitations of "a computer-implemented method," and alleges that "it is not clear which of the steps of the method are performed by a computer" [Office Action, page 6].

Applicant disagrees with the rejection set forth by the Examiner, as the claims pending prior to the foregoing amendment were clearly definite and would not prevent a person of ordinary skill in the art from interpreting the metes and bounds of the claims. However, *solely* in an effort to expedite prosecution, and in no way acquiescing to the propriety of the alleged rejection, the independent claims have been amended to recite, among other things, that "a selection of a security" or "a selection of one or more of the analysts" is received "from a user via a graphical user interface in communication with the computer."

Additionally, as discussed above, the independent claims have also been amended to recite that information relating to analysts' historical estimates is retrieved "from a database operatively connected to a computer," and that historical accuracy for the analysts is determined "using the computer."

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-20, 24-37, 40-49, and 52-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 is earnestly sought.

Applicant: GATTO
Serial No: 09/775,599
Filing Date: February 5, 2001
Page: 26 of 26


CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Date: July 24, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 47,429

By:
S. Jafar Ali
for: Registration No. 58,780

Customer No. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
Main: 703-770-7900
Fax: 703-770-7901